

William B. Abrams
end2endconsulting@gmail.com
1519 Branch Owl Place
Santa Rosa, CA, 95409
Tel: 707 397 5727

Pro Se Claimant and

Party to California Public Utilities Commission Proceeding I.19-09-016 to Consider the Ratemaking and Other Implications of a Proposed Plan for Resolution of Voluntary Case filed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, in the United States Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, In re Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Case No. 19- 30088.

Party to California Public Utilities Commission Proceeding I.15-08-019 to Determine whether Pacific Gas and Electric Company and PG&E's Corporation's Organizational Culture and Governance Prioritizes Safety

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re:

PG&E CORPORATION,

-and-

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY,

Debtors.

- ☐ Affects PG&E Corporation
☐ Affects Pacific Gas and Electric Company
☒ Affects both Debtors

** All papers shall be filed in the lead case,
No. 19-30088 (DM)*

Bankr. Case No. 19-30088 (DM)
Chapter 11
(Lead Case)
(Jointly Administrated)

**WILLIAM B. ABRAMS JOINDER TO
OBJECTION OF THE OFFICIAL
COMMITTEE OF TORT CLAIMANTS
TO CONFIRMATION OF DEBTORS'
AND SHAREHOLDER PROPONENTS'
JOINT CHAPTER 11 PLAN OF
REORGANIZATION DATED MARCH
16, 2020 [Dkt. No. 7306]**

Hearing: Telephonic Appearances Only

Date: May 27, 2020
Time: 10am PST
Place: Courtroom 17
450 Golden Gate Ave., 16th Floor
San Francisco, CA, 94102

Argument

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 15, 2020 the Official Tort Claimant Committee (“TCC”) filed the “*OBJECTION OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF TORT CLAIMANTS TO CONFIRMATION OF DEBTORS’ AND SHAREHOLDER PROPONENTS’ JOINT CHAPTER 11 PLAN OF REORGANIZATION DATED MARCH 16, 2020*” (“TCC Plan Objection”) [Dkt. 7306]. Additionally, the “*DECLARATION OF JERRY R. BLOOM IN SUPPORT OF OBJECTION*” (“Bloom Declaration”) [Dkt. 7331] was filed on March 15, 2020 and indicated that the TCC was significantly impaired by the Debtors’ enforcement of the TCC Restructuring Support Agreement (“TCC RSA”).

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that within the Bloom Declaration Mr. Bloom states on page 3, paragraph 6 “*I intended to cross-examine Mr. Wells on these subjects, but the Debtors took the position that the existence of the RSA precluded the TCC from cross examining Debtors’ witnesses before the CPUC.*”¹ During these same hearings at the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), I submitted testimony, filed briefs and cross-examined Mr. William Johnson, CEO, Mr. Jason Wells, CFO and other PG&E executives. I understand first-hand how the TCC RSA has undermined the efforts of the TCC to adequately represent their clients in these and many other critical matters.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that through participation in these hearings it was clear that the Debtors had every intention of leveraging the victim trust agreement, the registration rights agreement and the “hush and gag” clauses within the TCC RSA to undermine the agreed \$13.5B victim settlement and to make certain material changes to the financing of their plan.

¹ See “*DECLARATION OF JERRY R. BLOOM IN SUPPORT OF OBJECTION OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF TORT CLAIMANTS TO CONFIRMATION OF DEBTORS’ AND SHAREHOLDER PROPONENTS’ JOINT CHAPTER 11 PLAN OF REORGANIZATION DATED MARCH 16, 2020*”, [Dkt. 7331], pg. 3, lines 3-7

1 **PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that during these hearings it was revealed that the
2 Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation Code of Conduct had not been updated since August, 2013. Ms.
3 Kane, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer testified on March 2, 2020 to the fact that she has held
4 her position since 2015 before the 84 counts of manslaughter, before the 2017 PG&E North Bay
5 Fires, before the 2018 PG&E Butte County Fires, before the Kincade Fire of 2019 and before the
6 falsification of safety documents (euphemistically called “locate and mark”) as well as through many
7 other ethical/criminal lapses for the corporation. Also, consider that under cross-examination Ms.
8 Kane, PG&E Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer in response to my question on whether or not the
9 corporate code of ethics would be updated as part of their plan of reorganization indicated “*It’s*
10 *actually not something I have contemplated. I don’t know that others are.*”²

11 **PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that I join in the TCC’s objection because unlike the
12 TCC, I was not bound by the unlawful TCC RSA and was therefore able to actively participate in the
13 CPUC hearings. Through participation in these CPUC proceedings and by other means, I have
14 concluded that the plan is fatally flawed and undermines the financial stability of the Pacific Gas and
15 Electric Company as well as the Victim Settlement. Given this, I support the TCC in their objection
16 to the plan and agree that it would be imprudent of the court to confirm it knowing the Debtors’
17 intentions to strategically leverage the plan to assure investors’ short-term return and exit to the
18 detriment of the company, victims and the public. Furthermore, I reserve all rights to be heard by the
19 court in reference to the TCC Plan Objection and also reserve my rights to amend, supplement or
20 otherwise modify this joinder prior to or at the plan confirmation hearing.

21 Dated: May 19, 2020

22 Respectfully submitted,

23 

24 William B. Abrams

25 Pro Se Claimant

26
27
28

² See California Public Utilities Commission, Proceeding I.19-09-016, March 2, 2020 hearing, page 846